

OFFICIAL**HARTMAN AND HARTMAN, P.C.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ATTORNEYS
552 EAST 700 NORTH
VALPARAISO, INDIANA 46383****GARY M. HARTMAN
DOMENICA N.S. HARTMAN*****TEL:(219)462-4999
FAX:(219)464-1166**

* Also Admitted to Practice in Michigan

November 22, 2004

To: Assistant Commissioner for Patents	FAX # (703) 872-9306
Washington, D.C. 20231	

**Attention: Examiner STEPHEN CHOI
Group Art Unit 3724
Phone Number: (703) 306-4523**

Re: OFFICIAL RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR §1.111

The following is an OFFICIAL RESPONSE to an Office Action filed October 20, 2004, in the below-identified U.S. Patent Application.

Application No.	:	10/707,526	Confirmation No. 1525
Applicant	:	Patrick C. Urschel et al.	
Filed:	:	December 19, 2003	
TC/Art Unit:	:	3724	
Examiner	:	Stephen Choi	
 Docket No.	:	A3-1700	

Submitted by:
Gary M. Hartman
Reg. No. 33,898

The information contained in this facsimile message is privileged or confidential information to be used only for the purposes intended by the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is neither allowed nor intended. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone at the above number, and return the original message to us at the above address via the United States Postal Service. Postage will be reimbursed upon request.

PAGE 1 of 6

OFFICIAL**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 22 2004**

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION	
I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.	
	
Gary M. Hartman	Date: November 22, 2004

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No. :	10/707,526	Confirmation No. 1525
Applicant :	Patrick C. Urschel et al.	
Filed:	December 19, 2003	
TC/Art Unit:	3724	
Examiner :	Stephen Choi	
Docket No. :	A3-1700	
Customer No. :	27127	

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION-ELECTION REQUIREMENT

In the Office Action of October 20, 2004 (Paper No. 10192004), the Examiner required that Applicants make an election under 35 USC §121 between claims 1-13 (Group I) drawn to a cutting apparatus, and claims 14-20 (Group II) drawn to a cutting method. The Examiner also cited the application as containing claims directed to patentably distinct species of the claimed invention, and required that Applicants elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Application No. 10/707,526
Docket No. A3-1700
Amendment dated November 22, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2004

Restriction Requirement

Applicants elect to prosecute Group II, method claims 14-20, on the merits.

In doing so, Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement and request reconsideration in view of the following comments.

The Examiner stated that the basis for restriction between the apparatus claims of Group I and the method claims of Group II was distinctiveness under MPEP 806.05(e), as process and apparatus for its practice. Restriction was said to be proper because

the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus such as a cutting apparatus not requiring the specific means for individually delivering food products to the cutting means and the specific means for contacting the food products and positioning the food products set forth in group I.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action.

However, this basis for restriction erroneously interprets Applicants' independent apparatus claim 1 as requiring "specific means for individually delivering food products to the cutting means" and "specific means for contacting the food products and positioning the food products," when in fact no such limitations exist in claim 1.

The Restriction Requirement as stated restricts independent apparatus and process claims 1 and 14 from each other, and not merely their dependent claims. Only dependent apparatus claims recite the "specific means for individually delivering food

Application No. 10/707,526
Docket No. A3-1700
Amendment dated November 22, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2004

products to the cutting means" and the "specific means for contacting the food products and positioning the food products" cited as the basis for restriction. The mere fact that one or more dependent apparatus claims recite additional limitations to the apparatus *as claimed* in their parent apparatus claim 1 does *not* establish that the process *as claimed* in independent process claim 14 can be practiced by another and material different apparatus than the apparatus *as claimed* in claim 1. Accordingly, at the very least it is improper to impose a restriction between Group I apparatus claim 1 and Group II process claim 14, because the invention *as claimed* by independent process claim 14 has not been shown as being capable of being practiced by another and material different apparatus than the apparatus *as claimed* in independent apparatus claim 1.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the restriction requirement between apparatus claims 1-13 (Group I) and process claims 14-20 (Group II).

Application No. 10/707,526
Docket No. A3-1700
Amendment dated November 22, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2004

Election of Species

The Examiner stated that the application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species A (Paragraph [0017]);

Species B (Paragraph [0018], lines 1-5);

Species C (Paragraph [0018], lines 5-16);

Species D (Figure 2);

Species E (Figure 3);

Species F (Figure 6);

Species G (Figure 7); and

Species H (Figure 8).

The Examiner required that Applicants elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Finally, the Examiner noted that "some claims may be generic."

In response, Applicants hereby elect Species D (Figure 2) for prosecution on the merits if no generic claim is held to be allowable. Applicants believe that, of elected Group II claims 14-20, claims 14, 18, and 19 read on Species D (Applicants believe that these same claims also read on Species E). Finally, Applicants believe that, of elected Group II claims 14-20, independent claim 14 is generic.

Application No. 10/707,526
Docket No. A3-1700
Amendment dated November 22, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2004

Closing

Should the Examiner have any questions with respect to any matter now of record, Applicants' representative may be reached at (219) 462-4999.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Gary M. Hartman
Reg. No. 33,898

November 22, 2004
Hartman & Hartman, P.C.
Valparaiso, Indiana 46383
TEL.: (219) 462-4999
FAX: (219) 464-1166